



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/590,405	10/30/2007	Franciscus J. Klosters	NL04 0241 US1	8682
65913	7590	02/19/2010	EXAMINER	
NXP, B.V. NXP INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & LICENSING M/S41-SJ 1109 MCKAY DRIVE SAN JOSE, CA 95131			GUYTON, PHILIP A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2113	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/19/2010	ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ip.department.us@nxp.com

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/590,405	<b>Applicant(s)</b> KLOSTERS, FRANCISCUS J.	
	<b>Examiner</b> PHILIP GUYTON	<b>Art Unit</b> 2113	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 December 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                    | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)         | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Amendment***

1. The declaration filed on 10 December 2009 under 37 CFR 1.131 has been considered but is ineffective to overcome the Richmond reference.
2. The evidence submitted is insufficient to establish a conception of the invention prior to the effective date of the Richmond reference. While conception is the mental part of the inventive act, it must be capable of proof, such as by demonstrative evidence or by a complete disclosure to another. Conception is more than a vague idea of how to solve a problem. The requisite means themselves and their interaction must also be comprehended. See *Mergenthaler v. Scudder*, 1897 C.D. 724, 81 O.G. 1417 (D.C. Cir. 1897). In this case, the supplied evidence is not commensurate with the scope of the claims. In particular, the declaration does not contain any reference to "wherein the asynchronous processor uses an internal clock and remains dormant in the absence of a clock failure event," as recited in independent claims 1 and 6. Therefore, conception of the invention has not been established prior to the effective date of Richmond.
3. In view of insufficiencies in the declaration under 32 C.F.R. 1.131, the prior rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102 and 103 stand. Applicant is invited to re-submit, along with any additional evidence, in order to establish prior invention.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1-4 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,296,170 to Richmond et al. (hereinafter Richmond).

With respect to claim 1, Richmond discloses an electronic circuit arrangement comprising:

a clock fail circuit (figure 2, items 37-39 – clock source fail detect blocks and figure 4) arranged to receive a clock signal and to generate an error signal upon an absence of the clock signal (column 4, lines 50-52 and column 5, lines 56-67); and

an asynchronous processor (figure 2, item 36 – oscillator control logic) arranged to receive said error signal and to bring the electronic circuit arrangement into a pre-defined state upon detection of the error signal (column 4, lines 50-62), wherein the asynchronous processor uses an internal clock (figure 2, item 36 – TerClk input and column 5, lines 10-16) and remains dormant in the absence of a clock failure event (figure 2 and column 5, lines 27-39 – inherent that oscillator control logic only acts when clock failure is detected).

With respect to claim 2, Richmond discloses in that the asynchronous processor comprises an interrupt input for receiving the error signal and is further arranged to execute software instructions upon reception of the signal (figures 1 and 2, item 26 – fail interrupt register and figure 5).

With respect to claim 3, Richmond discloses an integrated circuit comprising an electronic circuit arrangement as claimed in claim 1 (figure 1).

With respect to claim 4, Richmond discloses a bus station for use in a bus system comprising an electronic circuit arrangement as claimed in claim 1 (figure 1, items 27-30).

With respect to claim 6, Richmond discloses a method for bringing an electronic circuit arrangement into a predetermined state, the method comprising:

detecting an absence of a clock signal using a clock fail circuit (figure 2, items 37-39 and column 4, lines 50-52);

generating an error signal in response to the absence of the clock signal (figure 4 and column 5, lines 56-67); and

bringing the electronic circuit arrangement into the pre-defined state (column 4, lines 50-62) using an asynchronous processor within the electronic circuit arrangement (figure 2, item 36), wherein the asynchronous processor uses an internal clock (figure 2, item 36 and column 5, lines 10-16) and remains dormant in the absence of a clock failure event (figure 2 and column 5, lines 27-39 – inherent that oscillator control logic only acts when clock failure is detected).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Richmond in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,959,014 to Pohlmeier et al. (hereinafter Pohlmeier).

Richmond does not disclose expressly wherein the bus station is a bus station for use in a LIN bus system.

However, Pohlmeier teaches determination of synchronization between transmitters and receivers in a LIN bus system (abstract and column 1, lines 12-27).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Richmond for use on a LIN bus system, as taught by Pohlmeier. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so because it is necessary to retain synchronization between nodes in a LIN bus system, as disclosed by Pohlmeier (column 1, lines 22-27). Thus, loss of clock, or clock error would be highly detrimental in a LIN bus system (Pohlmeier – column 2, lines 41-49 and column 4, lines 1-15). Richmond teaches a microcontroller integrated circuit, including bus system, with clock fault determination (abstract and figure 1), which would have been highly integratable with the LIN bus system of Pohlmeier, which teaches multiple microcontrollers and a bus system (column 2, lines 62-64).

***Conclusion***

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to PHILIP GUYTON whose telephone number is (571) 272-3807. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Beausoliel can be reached on (571) 272-3645. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2113

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Philip Guyton/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2113